11/30/84 50465-1 A

Arizona Labor Market NEWSLETTER
Arizona Department of Economic Security

Vol. VIII No. 11
November 1984

Unemployment Rate

Seasonally Adjusted
September*

ARIZONA	4.2%
Maricopa Co.	3.2%
Pima Co.	3.7%
UNITED STATES	7.4%

Consumer Price Index

National-August
1967 - Base Year

Wage Earner/Clerical Worker -	310.3
% Chg. Yr. Ago	3.6
All Urban -	313.0
% Chg. Yr. Ago	4.2

Phoenix-3rd Qtr.
1977 - Base Year

All Urban -	183.1
% Chg. Yr. Ago	5.7

Producer Price Index

National-September*
1967 - Base Year

All Commodities-	309.5
% Chg. Yr. Ago	1.4
Finished Goods -	289.8
% Chg. Yr. Ago	1.6

* Preliminary

In and Out of Poverty

Who is living in poverty? How long have they been there? Why is it always so hard for the Smith family to get by while the Jones family is constantly moving up the financial ladder? The recent Panel Study on Income Dynamics, conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, has revealed some interesting answers to these questions.*

The Institute report indicates that Americans move in and out of poverty** with surprising frequency. For the years 1971 to 1978, the study analyzed the economic fortunes of some 5,000 representative American households. Of those families in the lowest income bracket during 1971, only slightly more than one-half were there in 1978. On the opposite end, only one-half of those families in the highest income-bracket during 1971 were there in 1978. This suggests that there is considerable movement up and down the economic scale, as well as into and out of poverty.

During the 10-year period 1969 through 1978, one out of every four Americans experienced at least one year of poverty, but only 2.6 percent were considered "persistently poor," living below the poverty level for eight or more consecutive years. The temporary poor, those who were in poverty for only one or two years, were found to be very similar in characteristics to the general population, except for the

economic hardships. Economic hardship was most often found to be the result of movement out of the labor force, long distance residential moves, disability or a serious illness, unemployment or changes in union status.

The characteristics of the persistently poor differ radically from those of the general population. Four out of every 10 are disabled, 60 percent are black--compared to only 19 percent of the temporary poor--and two-thirds live in the South. One-third are elderly and of the remainder, 65 percent live within households headed by women. Almost 75 percent of these women are black and over one-half have children living at home.

According to the report, for those who are "persistently poor" the chances of moving into higher income brackets are, at best, marginal. Most of the persistently poor includes single women and their dependent children under the age of 18. Children not only increase household expenses, but also impose child-care responsibilities and other factors that severely constrain a mother's income-earning potential. For example, when a single woman with children loses her job, she generally seeks employment within a close proximity to the home. This attempt to keep a stable environment often results in only part-time employment or low-paying jobs. Opportunities for escaping poverty seem especially bleak for the elderly. Elderly persons living in poverty have little chance of escaping through the most common routes-- by acquiring employment with decent pay or by marrying someone who already has stable employment.

The 1980 Census has also revealed some interesting information concerning the demographic characteristics of the population living below the poverty level. Although the Census examines the population at one point in time (as opposed to the University of Michigan study which followed the economic fortunes of sample families over time), successive censuses can be used to analyze changes in the general composition of the poverty population.

From 1970 to 1980, the number of families in the U. S. living below the poverty level increased by 5.5 million and the poverty rate for families rose from 9.2 percent to 10.3 percent. In 1980 there were approximately 19.7 million white and 8.6 million black Americans living in poverty. The poverty rate for blacks was 32 percent, about three times the rate for whites (10 percent). In 1980, approximately 3.5 million Hispanics were living below the poverty level.

A large number of children also live in poverty. Approximately 11.8 million children under 18 years of age were living in households with incomes below the poverty level during 1980, constituting about 40 percent of all persons living below the poverty level.

Most of these children lived in one-parent households. About one-half were maintained by women with no husband present while only 11.8 percent were maintained by men with no wife present. The poverty rate for one-parent families was 32.7 percent in 1980 compared to 6.2 percent for married-couple families. It seems that married couples come to depend upon two incomes for their livelihood and if divorce or employment troubles arise, the chances for slipping into poverty can become great. Following divorce, the parent who retains the children is most often the poverty victim.

POVERTY IN ARIZONA

Comparisons between the 1970 and 1980 Census findings for Arizona's poverty population both enhance and conflict with conclusions reached by the Institute and trends observed on a national level.

The poverty rate in Arizona during 1970 was approximately 15 percent. In 1980 the rate dipped to 13 percent. Population growth and the actual number of people in poverty increased between 1970 and 1980 at about equal rates, although some groups fared better than others. While the pattern for single women with children followed national trends, the poverty rate for elderly Arizonans actually decreased.

Table 1 illustrates differences between Arizona's population and labor force composition over time. While the white and black populations increased at about an equal rate, total civilian labor force participation rates for blacks surpassed those of whites. The median family income of blacks also grew at a faster rate, although in current dollars it is well below the level maintained by whites.

Women also increased their labor force participation at a rate well above that for males. This was especially true for black women. However, the unemployment rates for black Arizonans increased more dramatically than for whites. As can be seen in the table, a higher proportion of black women are entering the labor force. This results in a higher unemployment rate for that group.

Single women with children entered poverty with greater frequency than any other group during the 10-year period (see Table 2). This can be partially explained by a higher labor force participation rate for women which was probably propelled by high divorce rates experienced during the 1970s. Poverty rates for black and white families followed relatively equal patterns over the 10-year period. However, poverty increased at a faster rate for white persons, especially those with children under 18 years of age, than for blacks (except for the group age 65 and over). Family-size reduction may be a factor in this trend.

The most surprising conclusion of the comparison between census findings was the performance of the elderly. The rate of poverty actually decreased for persons age 65 and over within Arizona during the 10-year period; however, the decrease was entirely among whites. The poverty rate for black elderly persons was still increasing, but at a very small rate (2 percent).

The poverty rate in Arizona actually decreased during the period of 1970 to 1980, although not equally across all groups. Because the labor force participation rate for women increased substantially during that period and many could not attain work, unemployment and poverty rates increased at a higher rate for this group. However, family size reduction seems to be a positive factor in slowing the poverty rate. Finally, the elderly seem to have fared well during the 10-year period. Although racial minority groups over age 65 increased their poverty rate slightly, the white elderly group has actually decreased its poverty rate.

Jeffrey D. Bowman and Guy R. Wilson

---

* Results of University of Michigan Panel Study on Income Dynamics as reported by Greg J. Duncan, "Who Gets Ahead?", American Demographics, IV, 7 (July/August 1982), 38-41; and Beckley Townsend, "Poverty and Plenty," American Demographics, VI, 9 (September 1984), 8 and 10.

** U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 133 (July 1982). Poverty level income for a urban family of four in 1980 was $8,438 for all states except Hawaii and Alaska.

Table 1: Selected Social and Economic Characteristics of Persons in Arizona by Race: 1970* and 1980**

	TOTAL			WHITE			BLACK		
	1970	1980	% Chg	1970	1980	% Chg	1970	1980	% Chg
Total Population	1,770,893	2,718,215	53%	1,613,335	2,260,288	40%	52,653	74,159	41%
Median family Income***	$ 9,185	19,017	107%	$ 9,482	19,947	110%	$5,716	13,724	140%
Civilian Labor Force	641,000	1,186,832	85%	603,009	1,022,589	70%	15,981	29,460	84%
Employed	614,055	1,113,270	81%	579,018	966,842	67%	15,045	26,149	74%
Unemployed	26,945	73,562	173%	23,991	55,747	132%	936	3,311	254%
Not in Labor Force	527,746	812,526	54%	478,849	691,157	44%	13,615	18,290	34%
Female Civilian Labor Force	239,891	495,378	107%	224,742	428,071	90%	7,141	13,509	89%
Employed	228,241	465,110	104%	214,056	404,951	89%	6,796	12,072	78%
Unemployed	11,650	30,268	160%	10,686	23,120	116%	345	1,432	315%
Not In Labor Force	376,336	542,821	44%	346,099	464,147	34%	8,547	10,349	21%

* U.S. Bureau of the Census, Selected Social and Economic Characteristics of Persons in Arizona by Race: 1970

** U.S. Bureau of the Census, Selected Social and Economic Characteristics of Persons in Arizona by Race: 1980

***Based on 1979 current U.S. dollars

Table 2: Characteristics of Families and Persons below the Poverty Level by Race in Arizona: 1969* and 1979**

	TOTAL			WHITE			BLACK		
	1969	1979	%Chg 69-79	1969	1979	%Chg 69-79	1969	1979	%Chg 70-80
Families	50,359	67,577	34%	37,650	42,100	12%	3,318	3,888	17%
persons per family	4.28	3.90	-.38	3.89	3.43	-.46	4.66	3.83	-.83
female householder	14,674	22,974	57%	10,634	13,476	27%	1,697	2,149	27%
with related children under 18 years of age	12,683	20,169	59%	9,019	11,793	31%	1,597	1,973	24%
Persons	266,498	351,365	32%	191,138	214,878	12%	17,735	18,950	7%
with related children under 18 years of age	80,557	127,889	59%	48,862	64,577	32%	6,930	8,051	16%
Age 65 and over	37,835	36,577	- 3%	32,552	28,094	-14%	1,810	1,855	2%

* U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of Families and Persons below the Poverty Level by Race in Arizona, 1970

**U.S. Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of Families and Persons below the Poverty Level by Race in Arizona, 1980

"Women, Welfare and Work": The Keynote Address

The following speech was delivered by Barbara Blum at the two-day conference "Women, Welfare and Work" held September 13-14, 1984. The conference was jointly sponsored by the Arizona Department of Economic Security and the Arizona Department of Education. Ms. Blum is the president of Manpower Demonstration Research Corp. in New York and president-elect of the Association of Public Welfare Administration.

"This conference focuses on the some 3 million American women, including over 26 thousand women in the state of Arizona, whose families live in whole or in part on public assistance. Their collective plight constitutes one of America's gravest social problems. First, there is the simple inadequacy of welfare as a means of family support. As if this were not difficulty enough, there are the special characteristics of many women on welfare--low levels of education and training, membership in minority groups, early childbearing--all of which hinder their ability to become self-sufficient. Finally, the explosive growth of female-headed families over the past decade, combined with the vulnerability of these families to poverty, singles out their employability needs as a topic deserving of special concern.

"While it would be foolish indeed to ignore the particular difficulties of welfare women, we do them a disservice by separating a discussion of their employability needs from a discussion of the needs of mainstream American women. So, I would like to step back for a few minutes from the question of welfare women and work to talk about the more general issue of women and work. It is my hope that this apparent detour may lead to a broader perspective.

"Historians tell us that the 20th century has been a period of almost inexorable growth in the participation of American women in the nation's paid workforce. Of course, women have always worked. For most women in the early 20th century, running a household and raising a family, especially without many of the labor-saving devices at our disposal today, was an arduous seven-day-a week responsibility. And even at that date, numbers of women worked outside the home as well.

"However, a wide range of employment opportunities in World War II increased participation of women in the labor market. Interestingly, as Alice Kessler-Harris tells us in her study Out to Work, so did the Depression, with women supporting their families when their husbands became unemployed; and so did the growth of the consumer society in the 1950s, pursuading increasing numbers of women throughout that decade and the 60s and 70s to get a job in order to supplement family income.

"In going to work, women with children and spouses typically have not viewed themselves as abandoning family obligations. Instead, they pointed to the financial support and comfort their paychecks brought as another way of meeting those family obligations. For many women in the 1970s, however, what had been an economic necessity also took on a life of its own. Increasingly, women have felt as free to seek fulfillment in work, as they have, and continue to do, in family life.

"By 1984, the forces of change begun early in the 20th century have become an established social fact. We read in the New York Times this summer that 63 percent of American women over the age of 16 now work; by 1995 three-quarters are expected to do so. In 1960, 30 percent of mothers with children under 18 were working; by 1980 that figure had climbed to well over half, 55 percent.

"Given such trends, the welfare system is in many respects anachronistic. To a considerable degree, the Aid to Families with Dependant Children program still bears a legacy from the very different era in which it began. Originally the AFDC program was designed as a complement to the Old Age and Survivors Insurance

Title of the Social Security Act of 1935. It was envisioned largely as a means of supporting orphans and children of widows whose husbands had not contributed to the Social Security program. Since it was widely assumed that the place of a mother was at home, little thought was initially given to the question of whether the government should try to help the mothers of these children to find jobs. Moreover, the expectation was that as Social Security coverage grew, the need for AFDC support would wither away.

"But as so often happens, social trends refused to conform to predictions. The AFDC program did not diminish; it grew. As time elapsed, the typical recipient was no longer a widow. More often than not, she was one of the growing number of divorced and unmarried mothers who have so dramatically changed the face of the American family over the past decades.

"It became clear that however important had been the original intent of AFDC--sustaining families in need--the government now had additional problems to solve. The presence of single mothers on welfare could not be dismissed as a passing phenomenom, nor was it accurate to view welfare women as a collection of individuals characterized by chance misfortune. Many were on the welfare rolls as a result of strong social forces which are not easily amenable to change. Thus, it was no simple task-- but obviously a critical one--for society to move beyond the relatively circumscribed goal of family assistance to the more challenging effort of helping these women find a better way of supporting themselves. The Federal Work Incentive program represented one attempt to respond to that set of employability needs, and more recently--and perhaps more forcefully--state-run work/welfare programs are beginning to address the problem.

"Nevertheless, there is the lingering programmatic assumption that the single mother should be at home supported by a welfare check until her youngest child is at least six years old. Such thinking strains the current social fabric. When over 40 million women work outside the home, it is inconsistent and classist for welfare women not to have the same choices as middle class and high income women.

"Furthermore, these attitudes contradict what we already know about welfare women: while an important minority of these women are long-term recipients, most do work, alternating spells of welfare with spells of employment. There is strong evidence that welfare women, even those who have been on assistance for a long time, share the desire for work with other American women. To cite just one example, the National Supported Work Demonstration, an innovative employment initiative studied by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, gave entry-level, low-wage jobs for 12 to 18 months to long-term welfare recipients, women who had been receiving public asistance for an average of eight years. After they finished that program, many of these women found and kept jobs, though frequently the financial gain of their jobs over welfare tended to be slight.

"Elsewhere in our society, too, there is a growing movement to bring the experience of welfare women more in line with that of other American women. This accounts for at least a part of the impetus behind the current development of state-run mandatory job search, work experience and training programs.

"However, we must look for more than changes in the policies and practices of the welfare system for AFDC women to find their place in the labor market. These women face many barriers, barriers we cannot fully address until as a nation we begin to deal with some of the critical employability problems confronting all American women.

"By no means has the steady growth of paid female work meant that women generally have been able to realize their full potential for productive employment in today's society. For this to happen, I

believe all women today have three needs: more access to good work opportunities; greater equity in compensation for their work; and better and more available child care services, coupled with opportunities for more flexible work schedules. Let us consider today each of these needs, as they relate to American women in general, and to welfare women in particular.

"Women have made significant inroads into the work world in recent years. Between 1970 and 1981, the number of women in management positions almost doubled, and women's enrollment in graduate and professional schools has increased dramatically. Still, 80 percent of America's female workers crowd into fields that are overwhelmingly dominated by women--clerical work, nursing, teaching, food service, library work, retail sales and domestic work--with the result that, even though the number of women employed has grown, the degree of job segregation between men and women is almost as severe today as it was 70 years ago. Almost invariably, female-dominated jobs tend to be at the lower end of the pay scale, and it is this factor as much as any other that explains why the average American woman today earns only 61 cents for every dollar a man earns.

"Righting this situation seems to require change on at least two fronts. In part, as a society we must re-examine the assumptions that permit us to compensate female-dominated work so poorly. Why, for example, as writers of one study on comparable worth asked, should jobs that require complex mothering and homemaking responsibilities--jobs in education, health and welfare work--be considered 'low skilled'? Or why in a state that found two occupations--registered nurse and vocational education teacher--to deserve exactly the same rating on a job evaluation study, do the registered nurses earn an average of $1,723 a month, while the vocational education teachers get $537 a month more?

"But at the same time that we are asking such questions, we must encourage women, particularly young women, to to broaden their horizons beyond traditional 'women's work.' One study tells us that when fourth grade girls are asked what careers they want to pursue, they typically answer 'teacher, nurse, secretary and mother.' Another recent study found that when school guidance counselors were given case studies of students with similar IQs, they generally counseled white males towards higher-status occupations than females. Still other research shows that girls and boys tend to perform equally well in elementary school but by high school, boys have outdistanced girls, especially in math and science, and what is more, girls are likely to believe that boys will do better than they will. All of these attitudes about performance are dysfunctional for a generation of young women who can expect to spend a large part of their adult lives in the work world and who therefore ought to be seeking access to as many opportunities as men.

"Once we are clear about the labor market patterns that consign so many American women to inequality, the economic conditions that conspire against welfare women are thrown into sharper relief. While most welfare women do manage to work at some times, their jobs tend to be low-paying dead-end positions in the female-dominated sector of the labor market. Jobs like these, even if far from ideal, can be useful as an income supplement to a two-parent family. But,

they seldom suffice for the single-headed household. One recent study on economic development sums up the current dilemma this way: with the emergence of so many double-income families, the labor market has evolved in ways that are more compatible with the needs and circumstances of two-parent than of single-headed households. The result is the troubling condition we have all come to know as the feminization of poverty. Only a few statistics are needed to sketch its contours:

- The median income of female-headed families with dependent children is only a third of that for husband-wife households.
- While in a husband-wife family, the chance of being poor is only one in 19, a child in a female-headed household has a one in three chance of living in poverty.

"Faced with a job that often fails to make ends meet, let alone provide a decent standard of living, it is not surprising that the former welfare recipient is apt to be able to develop only a weak attachment to the labor market. At times of stress--family illness, disruptions in child care arrangements, problems with housing--she is likely to cycle back onto public assistance.

"Like other American women, those on welfare generally have <u>not</u> been encouraged to set their sights high enough, to seek out more nontraditional work options that would keep them employed in careers with better futures. Like <u>other</u> American women, they need broadened opportunities for education and training. And in their case, society incurs a special cost, because the government must step in to re-establish welfare support when these women fail to develop stable work patterns.

"There is also the significant minority of welfare women who find it almost impossible to get access to any work at all. Traditionally, job developers serving AFDC clients have had to confront the reluctance of employers to hire welfare mothers, especially those with little or no work experience. One of the objectives of current workfare and work experience programs--which was also an objective of the Support Work Program--is to give such women a documented job history to show to employers.

"Besides access and pay equity, a third need shared by large numbers of American women is to have their children well cared for while they work. At present, the response to that need is most inadequate. The Children's Defense Fund estimates that more than one in six American children below the age of 13 may be without needed child care. What is more, the need for day care spans all age groups of children. With 41 percent of mothers of children under a year in the labor force, it is clear that there must be many more options for infant care. Women should also have the security of knowing that their school-aged children do not have to wait in empty homes until their parents return from their jobs. Studies indicate that the supply of before-and-after school day care is growing but not nearly as much as the demand. And although the problem has not been discussed

widely, I believe that teenage children of working parents require more after-school supervision than many now get. Leaving young people too much alone during these

years may have serious consequences for patterns of premature sexual activity. It may also contribute to the upsurge of precocious behavior leading to the 'disappearance of childhood' that some observers have written about.

"Closely linked to the issue of child care is a need for more flexible work schedules. Working mothers must juggle multiple responsibilities. If they need to, mothers should be able to drop off a child at a day care center before they are due at work. They should be able to make reasonable adjustments in their work hours to meet family obligations, such as doctor's appointments and school programs, and they should be able to choose part-time work without relinquishing claims to benefits. (These kinds of opportunities should of course also be extended to working fathers with child care responsibilities.) Changes like these are already taking place at a fairly rapid rate, but we must address them not on a case-by-case basis but as part of a systematic process of planning and implementation.

"Like problems of access and pay equity, needs for child care and more reasonable work schedules pose the greatest hardship to the low-income mother. Citing studies that show that one of every five or six women is unemployed because she cannot make satisfactory child care arrangements, the Children's Defense Fund concludes that lack of affordable day care is a major factor keeping women in poverty. One issue we must be sensitive to is that the federal income tax credit for child care has proved more useful to middle class than to disadvantaged women. According to the Congressional Budget Office, only about 7 percent of the 4.6 million families using the credit in 1983 had incomes below $10,000. When a family pays a low income tax, the credit is of little use. Of far more consequence to poor working mothers is the fact that in 1983, 32 states are providing day care to fewer children than in 1981. The total combined federal and state funding for Title XX child care dropped by 14 percent between 1981 and 1983. Even in Arizona, a state which has been among the more progressive in seeking out child care opportunities for those in need, availability of affordable day care for low-income women remains an issue.

"Furthermore, for those poor women who do have day care, some experts warn of a growing gap between the quality of child care available to them and to more affluent families. In testimony to Congress, Sheila Kamerman reported that a dual system of child care seems to be emerging. Middle-class parents increasingly turn to pre-school education for their children, while poorer families resort to more informal day care, which may not offer children the same opportunities for early enrichment and growth.

"Difficulties with work schedules, which are burdensome to any working mother, can create an insurmountable barrier for a low-income worker. It can be discouraging enough for a woman to make a series of unwieldy arrangements to have her child picked up at a day care center because she is not free to arrange her work schedule to do so herself. But for the welfare woman, especially if she lives in a rural area, rigid work hours, coupled with limited access to transportation. can entirely close her out of an already narrow job market.

"In several important areas, then, the employability needs of welfare women both arise out of and accentuate the difficulties facing large numbers of American women. Despite the many problems demanding better solution, I find it encouraging that today there is at least a growing recognition of two facts--first, that poverty in America is to a great extent a problem for women and second, that some of the most fundamental issues of feminism are issues of work and opportunity. Discussions based on such understandings should help us place the special employability problems of welfare women more directly in the mainstream--to remind us that while their problems are especially critical, they are not unique."

September 1984 (in thousands)

	ARIZONA				
				-- Amt Change --	
	Sep.* 1984	Aug. 1984	Sep. 1983	Aug. to Sep.	1983 to 1984
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE	1421.5	1379.2	1374.2	+42.3	+47.3
Total Unemployment	57.0	62.3	108.4	-5.3	-51.4
Rate	4.0	4.5	7.9	---	---
Rate (Sea. Adj.)**	4.2	4.3	8.2	---	---
Total Employment	1364.5	1316.9	1265.8	+47.6	+98.7

THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD NO

NONAGRICULTURAL WAGE AND SALARY EMPLOYMENT BY PLACE OF WORK

TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY	1151.2	1115.8	1079.0	+35.4	+72.2
Manufacturing	173.3	171.2	160.1	+2.1	+13.2
Durable Goods	136.5	135.3	124.4	+1.2	+12.1
Stone, Clay and Glass	6.9	6.8	6.7	+0.1	+0.2
Primary and Fabricated Metals	16.2	16.2	14.8	+0.0	+1.4
Primary Metals	6.9	6.9	6.7	+0.0	+0.2
Fabricated Metals	9.3	9.3	8.1	+0.0	+1.2
Machinery	68.1	67.4	62.5	+0.7	+5.6
Other Durable Goods	45.3	44.9	40.4	+0.4	+4.9
Aircraft and Missiles	20.5	20.3	18.2	+0.2	+2.3
Lumber and Wood Products (Except Furniture)	6.9	6.8	7.0	+0.1	-0.1
All Other Durable Goods	17.9	17.8	15.2	+0.1	+2.7
Nondurable Goods	36.8	35.9	35.7	+0.9	+1.1
Food and Kindred Products	8.2	7.9	8.4	+0.3	-0.2
Apparel	5.1	5.0	5.3	+0.1	-0.2
Printing and Publishing	13.2	12.9	12.4	+0.3	+0.8
All Other Nondurable Goods	10.3	10.1	9.6	+0.2	+0.7
Mining and Quarrying	13.1	13.4	14.2	-0.3	-1.1
Copper Mining	10.1	10.4	11.3	-0.3	-1.2
Other Mining and Quarrying	3.0	3.0	2.9	+0.0	+0.1
Construction	92.3	91.6	81.2	+0.7	+11.1
Trans., Communications, and Public Utilities	59.5	59.4	56.7	+0.1	+2.8
Transportation	25.6	25.3	23.8	+0.3	+1.8
Communications and Public Utilities	33.9	34.1	32.9	-0.2	+1.0
Trade	273.3	269.1	257.0	+4.2	+16.3
Wholesale Trade	55.4	54.6	51.3	+0.8	+4.1
Retail Trade	217.9	214.5	205.7	+3.4	+12.2
General Merchandise and Apparel	37.4	36.8	35.0	+0.6	+2.4
Food Stores	34.8	34.2	33.3	+0.6	+1.5
Automotive and Service Stations	26.1	26.1	24.5	+0.0	+1.6
Eating and Drinking Places	75.8	74.4	71.8	+1.4	+4.0
Other Retail Trade	43.8	43.0	41.1	+0.8	+2.7
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	69.4	69.6	66.1	-0.2	+3.3
Services and Miscellaneous	259.6	256.2	237.0	+3.4	+22.6
Hotels and Other Lodging Places	26.5	25.7	23.2	+0.8	+3.3
Business Services	56.8	55.1	47.4	+1.7	+9.4
Health Services	66.9	67.0	64.3	-0.1	+2.6
Other Services	109.4	108.4	102.1	+1.0	+7.3
Government	210.7	185.3	206.7	+25.4	+4.0
Federal	40.2	40.4	38.8	-0.2	+1.4
State and Local	170.5	144.9	167.9	+25.6	+2.6
School	101.6	74.2	101.7	+27.4	-0.1

* Preliminary
** Normal seasonal variations have been eliminated to reflect underlying economic trends.
NOTE--Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor,Bureau of Labor Statistics.

September 1984 (in thousands)

MARICOPA COUNTY					PIMA COUNTY				
			-- Amt Change --					-- Amt Change --	
Sep.* 1984	Aug. 1984	Sep. 1983	Aug. to Sep.	1983 to 1984	Sep.* 1984	Aug. 1984	Sep. 1983	Aug. to Sep.	1983 to 1984
903.5	875.1	853.7	+28.4	+49.8	260.5	254.6	255.3	+5.9	+5.2
27.5	29.4	52.7	-1.9	-25.2	9.4	10.2	19.4	-0.8	-10.0
3.0	3.4	6.2	---	---	3.6	4.0	7.6	---	---
3.2	3.3	6.4	---	---	3.7	3.9	7.9	---	---
876.0	845.7	801.0	+30.3	+75.0	251.1	244.4	235.9	+6.7	+15.2

BE USED FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

NONAGRICULTURAL WAGE AND SALARY EMPLOYMENT BY PLACE OF WORK

752.7	729.7	696.3	+23.0	+56.4	209.6	204.5	199.5	+5.1	+10.1
125.1	123.5	114.8	+1.6	+10.3	29.4	29.4	27.0	+0.0	+2.4
100.0	98.7	90.4	+1.3	+9.6	24.5	24.5	22.2	+0.0	+2.3
4.2	4.1	4.1	+0.1	+0.1					
10.4	10.3	9.5	+0.1	+0.9					
54.7	54.0	49.7	+0.7	+5.0					
30.7	30.3	27.1	+0.4	+3.6					
25.1	24.8	24.4	+0.3	+0.7	4.9	4.9	4.8	+0.0	+0.1
5.1	5.1	5.3	+0.0	-0.2					
2.9	2.9	3.1	+0.0	-0.2					
9.6	9.5	9.1	+0.1	+0.5					
7.5	7.3	6.9	+0.2	+0.6					
0.7	0.7	0.6	+0.0	+0.1	3.1	3.3	3.5	-0.2	-0.4
63.7	63.2	56.5	+0.5	+7.2	19.1	19.0	16.0	+0.1	+3.1
38.6	38.6	36.5	+0.0	+2.1	9.2	9.1	8.7	+0.1	+0.5
17.0	16.8	15.9	+0.2	+1.1	4.2	4.1	3.7	+0.1	+0.5
21.6	21.8	20.6	-0.2	+1.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	+0.0	+0.0
186.4	183.6	173.6	+2.8	+12.8	44.1	43.5	42.9	+0.6	+1.2
44.4	44.0	41.0	+0.4	+3.4	6.5	6.4	6.3	+0.1	+0.2
142.0	139.6	132.6	+2.4	+9.4	37.6	37.1	36.6	+0.5	+1.0
24.2	23.7	22.3	+0.5	+1.9	6.6	6.4	6.4	+0.2	+0.2
22.3	21.9	21.3	+0.4	+1.0	5.5	5.5	5.5	+0.0	+0.0
16.9	17.0	15.6	-0.1	+1.3	4.1	4.2	4.0	-0.1	+0.1
47.9	46.9	45.1	+1.0	+2.8	13.8	13.6	13.4	+0.2	+0.4
30.7	30.1	28.3	+0.6	+2.4	7.6	7.4	7.3	+0.2	+0.3
54.3	54.5	51.5	-0.2	+2.8	9.8	9.8	9.5	+0.0	+0.3
176.5	173.3	158.6	+3.2	+17.9	48.9	48.4	45.7	+0.5	+3.2
14.8	13.8	12.8	+1.0	+2.0	4.2	4.1	3.7	+0.1	+0.5
47.2	45.8	39.2	+1.4	+8.0	8.0	7.7	6.7	+0.3	+1.3
45.4	45.5	43.2	-0.1	+2.2	13.7	13.7	13.6	+0.0	+0.1
69.1	68.2	63.4	+0.9	+5.7	23.0	22.9	21.7	+0.1	+1.3
107.4	92.3	104.2	+15.1	+3.2	46.0	42.0	46.2	+4.0	-0.2

-- Prepared by Labor Market Information, Research and Analysis (CPS-MOD, 1/84)

NONMETROPOLITAN COUNTIES LABOR FORCE AND EMPLOYMENT

September 1984 (Preliminary)

	Apache	Cochise	Coconino	Gila	Graham	Green-lee	La Paz
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE*.	13,975	28,700	36,475	13,450	7,350	3,850	4,800
Total Unemployment	1,225	1,600	1,850	1,175	550	225	525
Rate	8.8%	5.6%	5.1%	8.7%	7.5%	5.8%	10.9%
Rate (Seas. Adj.)**. . . .	9.4%	6.1%	6.0%	9.4%	7.6%	5.9%	-INA-
Total Employment	12,750	27,100	34,625	12,275	6,800	3,625	4,275
THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS							
TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY. . . .	13,225	21,900	32,250	9,775	4,325	3,055	2,500
Manufacturing.	725	2,050	2,650	1,375	125	325	100
Mining and Quarrying	50	350	50	1,625	100	1,650	0
Construction	1,550	900	1,175	500	125	50	50
Trans., Comm., & Pub. Util..	1,650	1,350	2,200	250	150	50	50
Trade.	1,075	4,425	7,400	1,725	1,175	325	800
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate.	150	625	600	225	125	25	100
Services and Miscellaneous .	3,250	2,600	7,775	1,550	725	100	700
Government	4,775	9,600	10,400	2,525	1,800	525	700

	Mohave	Navajo	Pinal	Santa Cruz	Yavapai	Yuma
TOTAL CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE*.	22,025	23,950	29,525	8,475	29,850	35,025
Total Unemployment	1,425	1,675	2,725	1,250	1,650	4,225
Rate	6.5%	7.0%	9.2%	14.7%	5.5%	12.1%
Rate (Seas. Adj.)**. . . .	6.8%	7.7%	9.3%	13.1%	6.2%	-INA-
Total Employment	20,600	22,275	26,800	7,225	28,200	30,800
THE ABOVE LABOR FORCE STATISTICS SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS						
TOTAL WAGE AND SALARY. . . .	15,700	17,275	22,550	7,175	16,825	22,300
Manufacturing.	2,300	1,825	2,700	900	2,075	1,675
Mining and Quarrying	250	1,100	3,850	25	275	50
Construction	975	650	600	225	1,050	1,550
Trans., Comm., & Pub. Util..	975	1,625	1,000	550	900	1,000
Trade.	4,475	3,075	3,750	2,825	4,625	7,075
Fin., Insur., & Real Estate.	725	275	725	225	700	750
Services and Miscellaneous .	3,000	4,325	2,150	1,075	3,075	3,900
Government	3,000	4,400	7,775	1,350	4,125	6,300

*Adjusted to the Current Population Survey (CPS) to reflect place of residence.
**Seasonal adjustment not applicable for economic assistance programs.

NOTE--Series for Yuma and La Paz counties start January 1983. Data are not comparable to any past series.

Prepared in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

ARIZONA LABOR FORCE AND EMPLOYMENT FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
July 1984 (Final)

County	Civilian Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	Rate
Statewide	1,378,141	1,309,596	68,545	5.0%
Apache	14,126	11,662	2,464	17.4
Cochise	27,800	25,921	1,879	6.8
Coconino	35,598	32,418	3,180	8.9
Gila	13,505	12,200	1,305	9.7
Graham	6,937	6,371	566	8.2
Greenlee	3,777	3,524	253	6.7
La Paz	4,501	4,040	461	10.2
Maricopa	873,135	841,906	31,229	3.6
Mohave	21,090	19,567	1,523	7.2
Navajo	24,513	21,155	3,358	13.7
Pima	251,473	241,500	9,973	4.0
Pinal	28,446	25,591	2,855	10.0
Santa Cruz	8,343	7,028	1,315	15.8
Yavapai	29,612	27,631	1,981	6.7
Yuma	35,285	29,082	6,203	17.6

These figures are the only official BLS labor statistics to be used for revenue sharing purposes. They are not designed to be used as economic indicators. Note: Series for Yuma and La Paz counties start January 1983. Data are not comparable to any past series.

ESTIMATED HOURS AND EARNINGS OF PRODUCTION WORKERS IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES IN ARIZONA
September 1984

INDUSTRY	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS			AVERAGE WEEKLY HOURS			AVG. HOURLY EARNINGS		
	SEP.* 1984	AUG. 1984	SEP. 1983	SEP.* 1984	AUG. 1984	SEP. 1983	SEP.* 1984	AUG. 1984	SEP. 1983
FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA*									
Manufacturing	366.71	369.05	368.83	40.7	40.6	40.8	9.01	9.09	9.04
Aircraft & Missiles	INA	INA	495.03	INA	INA	43.5	INA	INA	11.38
Food & Kindred Products	307.71	310.84	338.91	39.4	39.1	39.5	7.81	7.95	8.58
Primary Metals	483.44	467.64	461.77	39.4	39.1	37.3	12.27	11.96	12.38
Machinery	325.58	323.36	353.38	40.8	39.1	40.9	7.98	8.27	8.64
Copper Mining	603.03	548.26	513.32	42.1	39.7	38.8	14.30	13.81	13.23
Construction	430.12	421.11	454.21	37.5	35.9	37.2	11.47	11.73	12.21
Utilities	562.40	562.40	516.40	45.1	45.1	43.8	12.47	12.47	11.79
Retail Trade**	236.64	235.96	217.03	34.8	34.7	33.7	6.80	6.80	6.44
Wholesale Trade	353.28	356.24	347.11	38.4	38.1	39.4	9.20	9.35	8.81

* Preliminary
** Excludes eating and drinking places.
NOTE--These estimates are based on a sample of full and part-time production and related employees whose payroll and hours are reported for the pay period which includes the 12th of the month. Prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

--Prepared by Labor Market Information, Research and Analysis (1972 SIC, 1/84)

THE ARIZONA LABOR FORCE IN SEPTEMBER 1984

Job creation was strong again in September as 47,600 Arizona residents found work. Although much of this was due to usual seasonal hiring as schools opened for another semester and winter tourism businesses began to expand, substantial growth was noted in most sectors. Except for the mining and the finance, insurance and real estate industries, every industry showed positive job growth with manufacturing, construction ~~and~~ services particularly strong.

Positive growth of this magnitude almost always causes the unemployment rate to fall, and September was no exception. Only two counties, Graham and Pinal, saw an increase in their unemployment rates. But the precipitous declines of 4/10s and 5/10s of a percentage point that were recorded a few months ago are probably a thing of the past. Many people are moving into the state and entering the labor force as evidenced the fact that although 47,600 people found work in September, the ranks of the unemployed declined by only 5,300.

Manufacturing's strength was in the traditional areas of electronics and aerospace, with most of that growth occuring in the Maricopa County economy. Defense expenditures and the general growth of consumer electronics continue to be a substantial base for this industry. A total of 1,000 people in the last month and 10,600 people in the last year have secured employment here. And equally important, particularly to the state's rural areas, has been the arrival of agricultural processing jobs associated with the chili season and cotton ginning. Businesses in Cochise and Pinal counties account for much of this work.

Construction was again strong in nearly every area of the state. In the state's northern counties, firms are rushing to get work done before cold winter weather arrives, while building continues at a fairly brisk clip in the rest of the state. Although higher mortgage rates have slowed growth in the industry, much work is still being done. The final industry of noteworthy employment growth was services. Although nearly every sub-industry expanded, the greatest growth continues to be in business services which includes temporary-help agencies as well as building maintenance and cleaning services. General commercial growth in the state has helped to fuel employment opportunities. If the current rate of growth continues, the services industry will soon surpass trade as the state's largest employer.

Economic conditions were again quite good in September, with job growth being recorded in both the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas of the state. But although the number of people unemployed now is by at its lowest level since October 1979 when 56,800 people were looking for work, all industries are not enjoying the expansion equally. In September, employment in copper mining fell to 10,100, its lowest level since March 1968 when the industry was at the end of a bitter nine-month strike. Excluding the impact of strikes, this is the lowest employment level ever recorded since employment-by-industry statistics began to be collected in the late 1950s. And the low price at which copper is selling does not portend improvement in the future.

Except for continued weakness in copper, Arizona's future looks bright. Manufacturing's growth appears solid for the foreseeable future and the combination of holiday buying and winter tourism should create many jobs in the coming months. Our current unemployment rate is at record lows both statewide and in Maricopa County. Compared to where we were a year ago and where the national economy is now, our economic future remains quite bright.

SMSA REPLACED BY MSA, PMSA AND CMSA

The familiar SMSA, or Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, was officially replaced by a new set of terms on June 30, 1983. If you continue more than one year later to use the term SMSA and are puzzled by the acronymns MSA, PMSA and CMSA, you are probably not alone. What are these new classifications and why were they developed?

BACKGROUND - The general concept of a metropolitan area is one of a large population nucleus, together with adjacent communities which have a high degree of economic and social integration with that nucleus. Standard definitions of metropolitan statistical areas were first issued in 1949 by the then Bureau of the Budget (predecessor of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget), under the designation "Standard Metropolitan Areas"; the term was changed to SMSA in 1959. From 1977 to 1981, the SMSAs were the responsibility of the Office of Federal Statistical Policy and Standards, Department of Commerce.

METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA (MSA) - Like its predecessor SMSA, the MSA is the basic metropolitan area classification. An MSA is a free-standing metropolitan area, surrounded by nonmetropolitan counties and not closely associated with other metropolitan areas. Each MSA must include at least: (1)one city with 50,000 or more inhabitants, or (2) a Census Bureau-defined urbanized area of at least 50,000 inhabitants and a total MSA population of at least 100,000 (75,000 in New England). 257 MSAs are recognized. They are defined in terms of entire counties except in New England, where they are defined in terms of cities and towns.

MSAs are further classified into four levels based on total population size: Level A -- 1,000,000 inhabitants or more; Level B -- 250,000 to 1,000,000 inhabitants; Level C -- 100,000 to 250,000 inhabitants; and Level D -- fewer than 100,000 inhabitants. Phoenix is a "Level A" MSA and Tucson, a "Level B" MSA.

PRIMARY METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA (PMSA) AND CONSOLIDATED METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA (CMSA) - Most of the largest metro areas having 1,000,000 or more people and meeting certain other criteria are classified as Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. The components of CMSAs are Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas and CMSAs must consist of two or more PMSAs. A PMSA is a metropolitan area that is closely related to another, such as Seattle and Tacoma, Washington; these two PMSAs constitute one CMSA.

Although this two-tier approach to areas over 1,000,000 seems confusing, it allows the classification of once smaller metropolitan areas that have been absorbed by an expanding neighbor as well as of suburban areas which have grown to have many of the characteristics of separate metropolitan areas while at the same time remaining part of a single metropolitan complex.

At present, there are 23 CMSAs, consisting of 78 PMSAs, in addition to the 257 MSAs. Overall, the total metro areas number 335 if you count MSAs and PMSAs; 280, if you count MSAs and CMSAs.

FASTEST GROWING METROPOLITAN AREAS - The 25 fastest growing metropolitan areas between 1970 and 1980 are listed in the accompanying table. Note that they are located in Sunbelt or Western states: Florida leads the list with nine metropolitan areas among the 25 fastest growing; Texas has four followed by three for Washington and two each for Arizona, California and Nevada. Colorado, Idaho and Utah have one each.

WHY THE CHANGES? - The new system of classifying metropolitan areas reflects America's metropolitan complexity. Under the old system, all metropolitan areas were classed as SMSAs whether they had a population of 1,000,000 or only 50,000. The new system is designed to permit separate analysis of metropolitan statistics, impor-

tant not only to federal, state and local planners but to planners in private industry as well.

Questions regarding the new criteria should be addressed to the Chief, Population Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C. 20233.

JoAnn H. Wilson

SOURCES: "Appendix II: Metropolitan Area Concepts and Components," Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1984, U.S. Bureau of the Census (894-904); "Goodbye SMSA, Hello MSA, PMSA (A, B, C, D)," The Number News, February 1982 (1,6-9); and Richard L. Forstall and Maria Elena Gonzalez, "Twenty Questions: What You Should Know About the New Metropolitan Areas," American Demographics, April 1984.

25 FASTEST GROWING METROPOLITAN AREAS
1970-1980

Metropolitan Area	Percent Change 1970-1980
Fort Myers, Florida	95.1%
Fort Pierce, Florida	91.7
Ocala, Florida	77.4
Las Vegas, Nevada	69.5
Sarasota, Florida	68.0
Fort Collins - Loveland, Colorado	65.9
West Palm Beach - Boca Raton - Delray Beach, Florida	65.3
Fort Lauderdale - Hollywood - Pompano Beach, Florida PMSA	64.2
Olympia, Washington	61.6
Bryan - College Station, Texas	61.4
Reno, Nevado	59.9
Provo - Orem, Utah	58.3
Brazoria, Texas PMSA	56.6
McAllen - Edinburg - Mission, Texas	56.0
PHOENIX, ARIZONA	55.4
Richland - Kennewick - Pasco, Washington	54.8
Orlando, Florida	54.4
Boise City, Idaho	54.2
Bradenton, Florida	52.9
Daytona Beach, Florida	52.7
Santa Cruz, California PMSA	52.0
TUCSON, ARIZONA	51.1
Vancouver, Washington PMSA	49.6
Brownsville - Harlingen, Texas	49.4
Redding, California	49.0

"10 HOTTEST TRANSFERRABLE SKILLS"

We often hear the advice that people who want to find a new job or career should examine their "transferrable skills"--that is, those skills gained in one occupation that may be readily used in another, possibly unrelated, occupation. According to Jim Shanahan, Manager of Employment and Equal Opportunity at Hughes' Helicopters, Inc., the "10 Hottest Transferrable Skills" are the following:

1. Budget Management.
2. Supervision.
3. Public relations.
4. Coping with deadline pressure.
5. Negotiating and arbitrating.
6. Speaking and communicating.
7. Writing.
8. Organizing, managing, taking charge of an event.
9. Interviewing.
10. Teaching and instructing.

Even if you're not considering a job or career change, you may want to keep this list in mind since you can expect to have to change jobs completely three times during your working lifetime. Developing these skills now may help ease the transition.

For additional information, request the LMI publication, Finding a New Job with Skills You Already Have by writing DES, Research Administration, at 733A, P.O. Box 6123, Phoenix, AZ 85005.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Construction - Construction has begun on a $12 million industrial park near Interstate 10 at Ahwatukee. Foothills Tech Plaza will consist of 132,000-square-foot and 40,000-square-foot buildings on 12 acres. The buildings are designed to fit the utility and space requirements of a large high-tech company. The project developer is considering a similar venture in Tucson.

A contract to construct a $7.6 million combat aircraft ordinance loading area at the Marine Corps Air Station in Yuma has been awarded to Maya Construction Co. of Tucson. The project will require one year to complete and could involve up to 150 local workers during construction.

The Tempe City Council has approved a proposal for a $35 million hotel development on the city's Double Butte property, south of Broadway between Interstate 10 and 48th Street. Opening of the resort hotel is planned for fall 1986. It eventually could have up to 540 rooms.

AT&T Communications has announced plans to build an $18 million data-processing center adjacent to the company's existing center on University Drive in Mesa. The expansion, scheduled for completion in summer 1985, will have about 150 employees.

Construction is under way on a 53,000-square-foot shopping center in Tempe. The $550,000 multiuse center, to be called Reflections Tempe, will provide space for retail-specialty shops, restaurants and offices. It is expected to employ about 100 people.

The first phase of a $25 million, high-technology business park in Scottsdale is under construction. The project will have 11 buildings containing a total of about 220,000 square feet. The first phase, consisting of three buildings including one occupied by Motorola, will be ready for occupancy early next year.

Manufacturing - A $19 million plant will be built for the Sperry Aerospace and Marine Group at the Arrowhead Ranch development in Glendale. The 225,000 square-foot facility is being constructed for the group's recently formed space systems division. Company spokesmen expect Sperry's Valley workforce to increase from the current 5,500 to between 8,000 and 8,500 by 1988. The payroll and local corporate purchases at that time should total between $400 million and $500 million annually. Governor Babbitt, present at the company announcement, said the Sperry facility is the "most important kind of test center for the Valley and the state" because it "involves not just assembly, but it is a high-tech engineer-oriented research firm."

Subiacolor Inc. and Photoworks, both of Phoenix, merged effective November 1. The new firm plans to build a 10,000-square-foot photo-processing lab scheduled to open in December. The number of employees will increase to 40 from the 35 now working for Subiacolor and Photoworks.

Mining - The Cyprus-Bagdad Copper Co. has contacted about 350 laid-off miners regarding a possible reopening of the Cyprus-Bagdad copper mine. About 625 miners were laid off in January and February due to the declining price of copper. Cyprus-Bagdad is a non-union operation, so there will be no labor negotiations.

Duval Corp. has announced plans to implement a 15 percent wage cut for all hourly and salaried employees at its Sierrita copper mine near Tucson. An overtime program, mandatory for most workers, will allow workers to maintain their income while increasing production at the mine. Employment at the mine is about 1,000, down from its peak of 2,500 three years ago.

Layoffs - Gates Learjet Corp. will lay off about 500 employees in Tucson--more than a third of its Tucson work force--and 500 in Wichita, Kansas because of a halt in some of its commercial aircraft production. According to a company spokesman, the temporary suspension of production of Learjet 30 and 50 series aircraft will continue indefinitely until inventories are reduced. Also, plans to relocate additional aircraft-assembly work from Wichita to Tucson, announced in July, will be deferred.

AT&T Consumer Products has announced plans to trim operations at its Phoenix Service Center as part of an AT&T Technologies Inc. Group cost-reduction plan. The consolidation involves about 700 jobs at four service locations across the country but it is unknown how the Phoenix center's 200 employees will be affected. According to a company spokesman, decisions regarding layoffs or employee transfers have not yet been made. The changes are another step in the August announcements by AT&T Technologies to eliminate 11,000 jobs, improve the use of space, and reduce locations that originally served telephone companies owned by AT&T prior to divestiture.

Store Closing - Sears Roebuck & Co., closed its doors in Douglas, affecting about 12 employees. The peso devaluation was cited as the reason for the closure.

Education - Maricopa County voters approved a $75 mission bond program to improve and expand the Valley's community colleges. Plans include three new community college centers located in Paradise Valley, Chandler/Gilbert and Litchfield Park, and the purchase of land in northeast Mesa and far northwest Maricopa County for potential development after the year 2000.

Technical equipment with an original value of nearly $1 million is being donated by IBM to Arizona State University and the University of Arizona. The equipment will be used for the fabrication of semiconductor circuitry in engineering laboratories at the two schools.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that college graduates continue to have clear labor market advantages over other workers, including a markedly lower unemployment rate, a higher rate of labor force participation and a larger share of managerial and professional jobs. In March 1984, the

unemployment rate for college graduates 25 to 64 years old was 2.7 percent, compared with 7.2 percent for high school graduates and 11.6 percent for workers with an eighth grade education or less.

Job recruitment at Arizona State University is 20 percent ahead of the level set last fall as defined by the number of recruiting days scheduled at the campus by companies. According to ASU's Career Services office, there is a demand for graduates in the technical fields, especially from the electronics industry in the Valley.

Portable Practical Education of Tucson plans to open a training center in San Luis for disadvantaged farm workers to provide them with job skills in business and high tech. Similar centers are located in Casa Grande, Ganado and Tucson.

Best Employers - Several companies with Arizona operations are listed among The 100 Best Companies to Work for in America, a recently published book written by Robert Levering, Milton Moskovitz and Michael Katz. The authors considered pay, benefits, job security, the chance to move up and "ambience." Qualifying for the top 10 list was Trammell Crow Co., an Arizona developer of office and industrial space. Joining Crow as one of the 10 best companies to work for in American is IBM Corp., a major Tucson employer. Other local firms cited are W. L. Gore & Associates, manufacturers of high-tech aerospace and camping equipment, with four plants in Flagstaff and one under construction in Phoenix; and Intel Corp., the California-based firm with about 2,500 Valley employees.

JOB GENERATION/BUSINESS BIRTHS AND DEATHS STUDY

The Research Administration is beginning a study on job generation/business births and deaths in Arizona. We would like to know what areas you feel are most important to investigate. Please indicate which of the following are of most interest to you by ranking each area from "1" to "8" with "1" being most important.

Return this form to DES, Research Administration - 733A, P. O. Box 6123, Phoenix, AZ 85005.

1.____Size of business by employment (e.g. small vs. large).

2.____Businesses relocating to Arizona from another state vs. expansion of existing firms.

3.____Job generation by industry (e.g. manufacturing vs. services).

4.____Business expansions vs. new businesses.

5.____Length of life of businesses.

6.____Job generation in rural or urban areas.

7.____Changes in business ownership.

8.____Other, please specify_____

_____

ARIZONA UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTIVITIES - AUGUST 1984

	AUGUST 1984	JULY 1984	AUGUST 1983	% Change From 1 Year Ago
Arizona Claimants Served*	29,649	28,160	43,043	-31.1%
Arizona Average Weeks Unemployed**	9.2	8.8	10.2	-9.8%
Arizona Benefits Paid*	$10,065,085	$8,659,073	$14,442,909	-30.3%
Arizona Trust Fund Balance	$231,074,129	$222,160,497	$177,707,565	+30.0%

*All Programs **UI Only

Reproduction of this publication for commercial use is prohibited by Section 39-121 Arizona Revised Statutes. Permission to reprint this publication, or parts of it, for nonprofit use may be granted upon written request, if credit will be given citing this publication and the Arizona Department of Economic Security.

This periodical is issued and printed by the Arizona Department of Economic Security as authorized by the Wagner-Peyser Act and is paid out of federal funds granted by the U.S. Department of Labor.

If you do NOT desire to continue receiving this publication, please check here ☐ and return this cover to address below.

If your address has changed, please indicate change and return this cover to the address below.

MARYLAND 20814
[illegible] EAST WEST HIGHWAY
[illegible] INTERNATIONAL INF. SERVICE
[illegible] WALDMAN MAS

Arizona Labor Market NEWSLETTER
LABOR MARKET INFORMATION PUBLICATIONS
Site Code 733A
P.O. Box 6123
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

POSTAGE & FEES PAID
EMPLOYMENT SECURITY MAIL
LAB 449
FIRST CLASS MAIL